

## **REMARKS**

### ***Introduction***

Claims 1-20 are pending, with claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 being independent. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 have been amended for clarity. In addition, claim 20 has been amended to correct a minor clerical error. Applicant has made the amendments to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, and not to distinguish any prior art.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In support of this rejection, the Examiner appears to argue that, because the simple delay-and-multiply circuit of FIG. 15 alone will not recover the symbol clock of an ATSC DTV signal, that the circuit cannot be used in combination with other circuits to accomplish this objective.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. FIGS. 18 and 19, and the corresponding portions of the specification, describe an embodiment that includes not only a delay-and-multiply circuit (elements 1816 and 1818 of FIG. 18), but also several other signal processing elements to prepare the ATSC DTV signal for the delay-and-multiply circuit. In particular, the ATSC DTV signal is processed by receiver 1804, intermediate-frequency (IF) filter 1806, downconverter 1808, which can include pilot filter 1810 and mixer 1812, and low-pass filter (LPF) 1814 before being fed to the delay-and multiply circuit. The signal fed to the delay-and-multiply circuit is in fact a quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM) signal, which as noted in the discussion of FIG. 15, is a type of signal that can be processed by a delay-and-multiply circuit to obtain a clock signal (see Applicant's specification, paragraph [0111]).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 10-12, 15-17, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,483,855 to Bradley et al. (hereinafter "Bradley") in

view of U.S. Patent No. 5,673,293 to Scarpa et al. (hereinafter "Scarpa"). Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Bradley and Scarpa as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,621 to Kuntz et al. (hereinafter "Kuntz "). Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, each and every element of the claimed invention must be disclosed in the combination of art applied. Because at least one element of Applicant's claimed invention is not disclosed in the combination of applied art, Applicant respectfully submits that no prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been established.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, is exemplary. That claim is directed to "recovering a symbol clock signal from an American Television Standards Committee (ATSC) digital television (DTV) signal" and recites "a downconverter adapted to coherently downconvert the ATSC DTV signal to a baseband signal". The remaining independent claims include similar recitations.

In contrast, Bradley appears to disclose a frame synchronizer for use with signals such as differential quadrature phase shift keying (DQPSK) signals. Bradley does not mention the ATSC DTV signal, or any type of signal like the ATSC DTV signal, which is a vestigial sideband (VSB) signal having a pilot carrier. Indeed, none of the signals mentioned by Bradley have a pilot carrier. Scarpa does nothing to remedy this defect.

The above arguments apply to the dependent claims as well. Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant submits that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, which action is requested. Filed herewith are excess claims fees required by the above amendments and a Petition for Automatic Extension with the required fee.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require action, it is respectfully requested

that the Examiner telephone Richard A. Dunning, Jr., Applicant's Attorney, at 831.420.0561 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Date: September 10, 2007  
Law Office of Richard A. Dunning, Jr.  
343 Soquel Avenue #311  
Santa Cruz, CA 95062  
Telephone: 831.420.0561  
Facsimile: 831.576.1419

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard A. Dunning, Jr. #42502/  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)